## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

LESLIE NICOLE KNIGHT AND \$
ALVEZA VALENZUELA, ON BEHALF \$
OF THEMSELVES AND ALL OTHERS \$
SIMILARLY SITUATED, \$
PLAINTIFFS \$
v. \$
CA NO. 5:24-cv-1097-XR
HOMAS JENEBY, MD A/K/A "DR \$
BOOM BOOM POW" ET AL., \$
DEFENDANTS

# AGREED SCHEDULING RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiffs Nicole Knight and Alveza Valenzuela ("Plaintiffs") and Defendants Thomas Jeneby, M.D., The Plastic and Cosmetic Center of South Texas, P.A., Palm Tree Plastic Surgi-Center, LLC, Trilogy by Dr. Jeneby, Inc., Advanced Medical Support Services, PLLC, Chrysalis Cosmetic Surgery Center, PLLC, South Texas Aesthetic Training LLC and Shining Palm Tree Series, LLC ("Defendants") (collectively the "Parties"), recommend that the following deadlines be entered in the scheduling order to control the course of this case:

Plaintiffs filed this case collectively under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"). Defendants intend to oppose Plaintiffs' request that notice issue in this case. As such, the Parties jointly recommend that the following deadlines be entered in a preliminary scheduling order, which shall control discovery concerning whether it is appropriate for notice to issue in this matter, with the Court's standard scheduling order to be entered once issues regarding notice have been determined.

These recommendations are made in light of the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Swales v. KLLM Transp. Servs, L.L.C.*, which held that, when managing a putative FLSA collective action, "a

district court should identify, at the outset of the case, what facts and legal considerations will be material to determining whether a group of 'employees' is 'similarly situated' . . . [a]nd then it should authorize preliminary discovery accordingly." 895 F.3d 430, 441 (5th Cir. 2021).

The Parties believe that future scheduling deadlines will be determined in large part by prenotice discovery, as well as briefing concerning the appropriateness of granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Notice. Accordingly, the Parties believe that the most efficient manner to proceed would be to attend to class issues initially (Phase I discovery) and then to submit additional scheduling recommendations once class issues have been resolved (Phase II).

In that regard, the Parties propose that Phase I discovery, limited to the appropriateness of notice issuing in this matter, last <u>90 days</u> from the date of the Court's entry of the corresponding scheduling order.

The Parties further propose that Plaintiffs' Motion for Notice be filed within <u>120 days</u> from the date of the Court's entry of the corresponding scheduling order, with Defendants' Response due <u>21 days</u> after the date of Plaintiffs' Motion for Notice, and Plaintiffs' Reply due <u>7 days</u> after the date of Defendant' Response.

Therefore, the Parties respectfully request that the Court require that the Parties submit additional joint proposed scheduling recommendations, including deadlines for the items in the Court's form scheduling order, <u>not later than 15 days after</u> either (1) the close of the class notice period, if any, or (2) the date the Court denies Plaintiffs' Motion for Notice.

## Respectfully Submitted,

### /s/ Josef F. Buenker

Josef F. Buenker State Bar No. 03316860 Attorney-in-Charge The Buenker Law Firm PO Box 10099 Houston, Texas 77206 713-868-3388 Telephone 713-683-9940 Facsimile jbuenker@buenkerlaw.com

Douglas B. Welmaker State Bar No. 00788641 Welmaker Law, PLLC 409 N. Fredonia, Suite 118 Longview, Texas 75601 Phone: (512) 799-2048 doug@welmakerlaw.com

### /s/ Tiffany Cox Stacy

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.
Tiffany Cox Stacy
Texas Bar No. 24050734
tiffany.cox@ogletree.com
Shavonne L. Smith
Texas Bar No. 24054956
shavonne.smith@ogletreedeakins.com
112 E. Pecan Street, Suite 2700
San Antonio, Texas 78205

Telephone: 210.354.1300 Fax: 210.277.2702

### ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

#### ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS